



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/993,387 | 11/16/2001 | Jeffrey Raynor | 00ED18852609 | 4936 |
| 27975 | 7590 | 01/24/2006 | EXAMINER | |
| ALLEN, DYER, DOPPELT, MILBRATH & GILCHRIST P.A. 1401 CITRUS CENTER 255 SOUTH ORANGE AVENUE P.O. BOX 3791 ORLANDO, FL 32802-3791 | | | DANIELS, ANTHONY J | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2615 | |

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 09/993,387 | RAYNOR ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | Anthony J. Daniels | 2615 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anthony J. Daniels. (3) _____.

(2) Doug Visnius. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 January 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: Lee et al. (US 6,466,265).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Doug Visnius contacted the examiner asking for an explanation of prior art used to reject.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


DAVID OMETZ
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---------------------|

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER

20060117

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This communication is applicable to all independent claims for each independent claim has the same issue common.

The pixel array "10" of Figure 2A and 2B of Lee et al. is interpreted by examiner to be an entity; meaning, if there is a connection between one pixel, there is a connection between the array of pixels. Examiner feels that this reads on the current claim language. This interpretation is different from saying that there is a conductor connected between the readout electronics and each PIXEL IN THE ARRAY. The claim simply states "...each conductor in the multiconductor signal bus provides a readout channel dedicated to one pixel." Evidence of this interpretation in the Office Action dated 11/22/2005 is the fact that the examiner only cited the wires connecting pixels 1-4 as the multiconductor signal bus.

DAVID OMETZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Anthony Daniels
1/17/2006